

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the Office Action of February 19, 2009 is respectfully requested. On the cover sheet of the Office Action there is indicated that the drawings filed on 10 December 2008 were accepted. There is, however, also still checked off the “objected to” box. As the body of the Office Action was free of any drawing discussion, it has been presumed that the “objected to” box check was inadvertent and meant to have been replaced by the current “accepted” box.

In the present Amendment the claims have been amended as summarized below:

A) Independent claims 18 and 36 have been amended as explained below.

B) Allowed independent claim 25 remains as previously presented.

C) New dependent claims 58 to 63 have been added.

D) New independent claim 64 has been added.

In the Office Action, the claims were rejected under the prior art as summarized below.

Ref.	Claims	Statutory Grounds	Reference(s)
A	18, 20, 21, 23, 56 and 57	35 U.S.C. 103(a)	Cramer (6,039,827) in view of Adams (2,961,130)
B	36 and 38	35 U.S.C. 102(b)	Bezaire (6,315,161)

In the Office Action rejection of claim 18 reliance was placed on the secondary reference of Adams in an effort to remedy the deficiency in Cramer relative to a lack of a disclosure in Cramer of an inlet filter. Reference is made in the Office Action to the inlet strainer 25 in Adams which is shown supported by the pump assembly and designed to receive the fuel provided in the fuel tank and fed to the lower, independent suction impeller via base conduit 26 and inlet eye 20. Claim 18 on the other hand provides an arrangement that is described in conjunction with the inlet and drive shaft orientation that is not in any way shown or suggested by the arrangement in Adams (the only reference describing an inlet filter in the applied combination).

As seen from current claim 18, a fluid contact surface of the inlet filter extends across a lower region of the inlet filter with an extension of the axis of elongation of the drive shaft (extending from the free of the drive shaft) intercepting a fluid contact surface of the filter. A non-limiting embodiment of the claim 18 arrangement is illustrated in Figures 94 and 95 and associated disclosure on pages 104 to 110 of the present application. This arrangement is not in

anyway shown or described in the applied combination nor an obvious variant. Further, the second strainer 27 presented in Adams also fails to represent the claim 18 arrangement.

Independent claim 36 was rejected as being deemed anticipated by Bezaire. As seen from the current claim 36 there is featured an external plug member. This claim 36 arrangement (with a plug member associated with the pump assembly that is suited for plugging the feed port of the arrangement of the detachable valve) is far removed from a fixed in position valve member with a no return ball-check valve downstream as featured in the Bezaire reference. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim.

New independent claim 64 features a filter, inlet manifold and drive shaft arrangement not appreciated or suggested in the prior art. Thus it too is respectfully submitted to be in condition for allowance.

The dependent claims depend from the above described independent claims and thus are submitted to be allowable together with the noted independent claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it courteously is urged that all of the remaining claims are allowable and that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable action in this regard is earnestly solicited.

If any fees are due in connection with the filing of this Amendment, such as fees under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, please charge the fees to Deposit Account 02-4300; Order No. 034017R004.

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: /Dennis C. Rodgers/
Dennis C. Rodgers, Reg. No. 32,936
1130 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Dated: May 19, 2009